arXiv:1512.07092v1 [math.AG] 22 Dec 2015

AN ELEMENTARY APPROACH TO CONTAINMENT RELATIONS BETWEEN SYMBOLIC AND ORDINARY POWERS OF CERTAIN MONOMIAL IDEALS

RYAN W. KEANE, ALEX KÜRONYA, AND ELISE MCMAHON

1. Introduction

The purpose of this note is to find an elemenary explanation of a surprising result of Ein–Lazarsfeld–Smith [ELS] and Hochster–Huneke [HH] on the containment between symbolic and ordinary powers of ideals in simple cases. This line of research has been very active ever since, see for instance [BC, HaH, DST] and the references therein, by now the literature on this topic is quite extensive.

By 'elementary' we refer to arguments that among others do not make use of resolution of singularities and multiplier ideals nor tight closure methods. Let us quickly recall the statement [ELS]: let X be a smooth projective variety of dimension n, $\mathscr{I} \subseteq \mathscr{O}_X$ a non-zero sheaf of radical ideals with zero scheme $Z \subseteq X$; if every irreducible component of Z has codimension at least e, then

$$\mathscr{I}_Z^{(me)} \subseteq \mathscr{I}_Z^m$$

for all $m \geqslant 1$.

Our goal is to reprove this assertion in the case of points in projective spaces (as asked in [PAG2, Example 11.3.5]) without recurring to deep methods of algebraic geometry. Instead of working with subsets of projective space, we will concentrate on the affine cones over them; our aim hence becomes to understand symbolic and ordinary powers ideals of sets of line through the origin.

We will end up reducing the general case to a study of the ideals

$$I_{2,n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(x_i x_j \mid 1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n\right) \subseteq k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$$

defining the union of coordinate axes in $\mathbb{A}_k^n$. We work over an arbitrary field k.

Theorem 1 (Corollary 2.7)**.** *Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ be a set of n points not lying in a hyperplane. Then*

$$\mathscr{I}_\Sigma^{(\lceil (2-\frac{2}{n})m \rceil)} \subseteq \mathscr{I}_\Sigma^m$$

for all positive integers m.

If $n = 3$, then the same statement holds for three distinct points in arbitrary position.

Acknowledgements. This work is the result of an 'Elective Undergraduate Research' class at the Budapest Semesters in Mathematics in Spring 2014. After our proofs were completed, Brian Harbourne and Tomasz Szemberg have pointed out closely related work in the area (see Remark 2.8,

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 14C99, 13C05.

Remark 2.9, and Remark 2.10, respectively, for more precise statements and references) for which we are grateful.

2. Proof of the main result

The key idea is to describe the primary decomposition of $I_{2,n}$.

Proposition 2.1. *With notation as above, the expression*

$$I_{2,n}^m = \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n (x_1,\ldots,\widehat{x_i},\ldots,x_n)^m\right) \cap (x_1,\ldots,x_n)^{2m} \tag{2.1.1}$$

is a primary decomposition of $I_{2,n}^m$ for all positive integers m.

Proof. Being an irredundant intersection of primary ideals, the right-hand side of (2.1.1) will be a primary decomposition of $I_{2,n}^m$ once equality holds.

We assume that $n \geqslant 3$, the other cases being trivial. Since $I_{2,n} = \cap_{i=1}^n (x_1,\ldots,\widehat{x_i},\ldots,x_n)$ and $I_{2,n} \subseteq I_{1,n}^2$, we have

$$I_{2,n}^m \subseteq \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n (x_1,\ldots,\widehat{x_i},\ldots,x_n)^m\right) \cap (x_1,\ldots,x_n)^{2m} .$$

For the reverse inclusion, note that both sides are monomial ideals, therefore it will suffice to check the required containment for monomials by [HeHi, Theorem 1.1.2]

A monomial $x_1^{a_1}\ldots x_n^{a_n}$ is an element of the right-hand side of (2.1.1) if and only if the inequalities

$$a_1+\ldots+\widehat{a_i}+\ldots+a_n \quad \geqslant m \quad \text{for all } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n, \tag{2.1.2}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \quad \geqslant \quad 2m \tag{2.1.3}$$

hold. We will show by induction on m that under these conditions $x_1^{a_1}\ldots x_n^{a_n} \in I_{2,n}^m$. For the base case $m=1$ of the induction, one has

$$I_{2,n} = \bigcap_{i=1}^n (x_1,\ldots,\widehat{x_i},\ldots,x_n) \subseteq I_{1,n} ,$$

as $I_{2,n}$ is the radical ideal of the union of all coordinate axes in $\mathbb{A}^n$.

Let us now assume that (2.1.1) holds for all integers less than m, and let

$$x_1^{a_1}\ldots x_n^{a_n} \in \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n (x_1,\ldots,\widehat{x_i},\ldots,x_n)^m\right) \cap (x_1,\ldots,x_n)^{2m}$$

be an arbitrary monomial, without loss of generality we will suppose that $a_1 \geqslant \ldots \geqslant a_n$. It follows from the inequality (2.1.3) that the total degree of $x_1^{a_1}\ldots x_n^{a_n}$ is at least $2m$.

Let us first consider the case $a_1 = \ldots = a_n = a$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = 2m$. If n is even, then

$$x_1^{a_1}\ldots x_n^{a_n} = x_1^a\ldots x_n^a = (x_1x_2)^a\ldots(x_{n-1}x_n)^a \in I_{2,n}^m ,$$

if n is odd, then $a = 2b$ for some natural number b (since $an = 2m$), and

$$x_1^{a_1} \dots x_n^{a_n} = x_1^a \dots x_n^a = (x_1x_2)^b (x_2x_3)^b \dots (x_{n-1}x_n)^b (x_nx_1)^b \in I_{2,n}^m \ .$$

From now on we will assume that not all exponents a_i are the same, and keep the assumption that $a_1 \geqslant \dots \geqslant a_n$. Also, without loss of generality we will suppose that $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i = \deg x_1^{a_1} \dots x_n^{a_n} = 2m$: if it were strictly higher, then either $A - a_i > m$ for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, and we can divide $x_1^{a_1} \dots x_n^{a_n}$ by some variable and still obtain a monomial in the same ideal (and then possibly reorder the variables to preserve the decreasing exponents), or, if $A - a_1 = m$ (which is the smallest one among the $A - a_i$'s), then $a_1 = A - m > m$, hence replacing $x_1^{a_1} \dots x_n^{a_n}$ by $x_1^{a_1-1} x_2^{a_2} \dots x_n^{a_n}$ will again do the trick.

We proceed by a greedy algorithm: we intend to show that

$$x_1^{a_1-1} x_2^{a_2-1} x_3^{a_2} \dots x_n^{a_n} \in I_{2,n}^{m-1}$$

by verifying that the exponent vector satifsfies that system (2.1.1) for $m-1$. Granting this, it follows that

$$x_1^{a_1} \dots x_n^{a_n} = (x_1x_2) \cdot x_1^{a_1-1} x_2^{a_2-1} x_3^{a_3} \dots x_n^{a_n} \in I_{2,n}^m \ ,$$

as required.

We need to check that

$$A - (a_i - d_i) \geqslant m-1 \ \text{ for all } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n,$$

where $d_1 = d_2 = 1$, and $d_i = 0$ for all $i \geqslant 3$, and

$$A - 2 \geqslant 2(m-1) \ .$$

Of these, the last equality is immediate, we will deal with the rest. As $a_1 \geqslant a_2 \geqslant \dots \geqslant a_n$, we have

$$m \leqslant A - a_1 \leqslant \dots \leqslant A - a_n \ ,$$

hence we are done whenever either $i = 1, 2$, or $i \geqslant 3$ and $a_i < a_1$.

Let us suppose that this is not the case, and there exists an index $3 \leqslant i \leqslant n$ such that $a_1 = a_i$. By the ordering of the a_i's this automatically means $a_1 = \dots = a_j = \dots = a_i$ for all $1 \leqslant j \leqslant i$. Note that even in this case, $A - a_i - 2 \geqslant m-1$ if $A - a_i > m$, hence aiming at a contradiction we can assume $A - a_i = m$. On the other hand,

$$2m = A = m + a_i \ ,$$

therefore $a_1 = \dots = a_i = m$, and consequently,

$$2m = A \geqslant a_1 + \dots + a_i \geqslant 3m \ ,$$

a contradiction. □

Lemma 2.2. *With notation as above,*

$$I_{2,n}^{(m)} = \bigcap_{i=1}^n (x_1, \dots, \widehat{x_i}, \dots, x_n)^m \ .$$

Proof. Follows quickly from the facts that symbolic and ordinary powers of $(x_1,\dots,x_i)$ agree, and the fact that

$$I_{2,n} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n}(x_1,\dots,\widehat{x_i},\dots,x_n)$$

is an irredundant intersection where all prime ideals on the right-hand side are minimal. □

Remark 2.3. Observe that for a monomial $x_1^{a_1}\dots x_n^{a_n} \in k[x_1,\dots,x_n]$, $x_1^{a_1}\dots x_n^{a_n} \in I_{2,n}^{(m)}$ if and only if $A - a_i \geqslant m$ for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$.

Proposition 2.4. *With notation as above,*

$$I_{2,n}^{(\lceil (2-\frac{2}{n})m\rceil)} \subseteq I_{2,n}^{m}$$

for all $m \geqslant 1$.

Proof. Assume $d \geqslant \lceil (2-\frac{2}{n})m\rceil$. For a monomial $x_1^{a_1}\dots x_n^{a_n} \in I_{2,n}^{(d)}$, Remark 2.3 implies $A - a_i \geqslant d$ for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, hence

$$nA - A \geqslant nd\ ,$$

and

$$A \geqslant \frac{n}{n-1}d \geqslant \frac{n}{n-1}\cdot(2-\frac{2}{n})m \geqslant 2m\ ,$$

and $x_1^{a_1}\dots x_n^{a_n} \in I_{2,n}^{m}$ by Proposition 2.1 as required. □

Remark 2.5. It appears that in the concrete case the bound from [ELS], which is $2m$, where the 2 stands for the codimension of the union of coordinate axes), is far from optimal even for $n = 3$.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{A}_k^n$ be a union of n lines through the origin not lying in a hyperplane, where k is an arbitrary field. Then*

$$I(X)^{(\lceil (2-\frac{2}{n})m\rceil)} \subseteq I(X)^m$$

for all $m \geqslant 1$.

If $n = 3$ then the statement holds for any three distinct lines through the origin.

Proof. Let $\phi\colon \mathbb{A}^n \to \mathbb{A}^n$ be an invertible linear map taking the coordinates axes in $\mathbb{A}^n$ to the lines in X. Then ϕ^* induces an automorphism of $\mathbb{C}[x_1,\dots,x_n]$, under which $I(X)^{(\lceil (2-\frac{2}{n})m\rceil)}$ corresponds to $I_{2,n}^{(\lceil (2-\frac{2}{n})m\rceil)}$, and $I(X)^m$ corresponds to $I_{2,n}^m$.

As far as the case $n = 3$ is concerned, observe that three lines through the origin that lie in a plane form a complete intersection subvariety, and as such, m^{th} symbolic and ordinary powers of its vanishing ideal will agree for any given $m \geqslant 1$. □

Corollary 2.7. *Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathbb{P}_k^{n-1}$ be a set of n points not lying in a hyperplane. Then*

$$\mathscr{I}_\Sigma^{(\lceil (2-\frac{2}{n})m\rceil)} \subseteq \mathscr{I}_\Sigma^m$$

for all positive integers m.

If $n = 3$, then the result holds for any three distinct points.

In the rest of the article we outline connections to closely related work in the area. For terminology not used in our paper we refer to [BC, BC2, PS].

Remark 2.8. As n general points in $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ form a star configuration, the initial degree and the regularity of the associated ideal agree, hence [BC2, Corollary 1.2] applies. Combined with [PS, Lemma 8.4.7 (c)], this gives a way to establish a bound similar in nature to Corollary 2.7.

Remark 2.9. In [PS, Example 8.4.5] a bound stronger then the one in [ELS] is shown for all monomial ideals. Nevertheless, in the particular case we treated the bound of [PS, Example 8.4.5] is weaker than Corollary 2.7.

Remark 2.10. Multiplier ideals of line arrangements and their relationship to symbolic powers were studied for instance in [T1] and [T2].

REFERENCES

[BC] Cristiano Bocci and Brian Harbourne, *Comparing powers and symbolic powers of ideals*, J. Algebraic Geom. **19** (2010), no. 3, 399–417, DOI 10.1090/S1056-3911-09-00530-X. ↑1, 2

[BC2] Cristiano Bocci and Brian Harbourne, *The resurgence of ideals of points and the containment problem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **138** (2010), no. 4, 1175–1190, DOI 10.1090/S0002-9939-09-10108-9. ↑2, 2.8

[DST] Marcin Dumnicki, Tomasz Szemberg, and Halszka Tutaj-Gasińska, *Counterexamples to the $I^{(3)} \subset I^2$ containment*, J. Algebra **393** (2013), 24–29, DOI 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2013.06.039. MR3090054 ↑1

[ELS] Lawrence Ein, Robert Lazarsfeld, and Karen E. Smith, Inv. Math. **111** (111), no. 111, 551–566 (electronic), DOI 10.1090/S0002-9947-02-03180-X. MR1932713 (2003j:14007) ↑1, 2.5, 2.9

[HeHi] Jürgen Herzog and Takayuki Hibi, *Monomial ideals*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 260, Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2011. ↑2

[HaH] Brian Harbourne and Craig Huneke, *Are symbolic powers highly evolved?*, J. Ramanujan Math. Soc. **28A** (2013), 247–266. ↑1

[HH] Melvin Hochster and Craig Huneke, *Comparison of symbolic and ordinary powers of ideals*, Invent. Math. **147** (2002), no. 2, 349–369, DOI 10.1007/s002220100176. ↑1

[PAG2] Robert Lazarsfeld, *Positivity in algebraic geometry. II*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge., vol. 49, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. ↑1

[PS] Thomas Bauer, Sandra Di Rocco, Brian Harbourne, Michał Kapustka, Andreas Knutsen, Wioletta Syzdek, and Tomasz Szemberg, *A primer on Seshadri constants*, Interactions of classical and numerical algebraic geometry, 2009, pp. 33–70, DOI 10.1090/conm/496/09718. ↑2, 2.8, 2.9

[T1] Zachariah C. Teitler, *Bounding symbolic powers via asymptotic multiplier ideals*, Ann. Univ. Paedagog. Crac. Stud. Math. **8** (2009), 67–77. ↑2.10

[T2] ———, *Multiplier ideals of general line arrangements in $\mathbb{C}^3$*, Comm. Algebra **35** (2007), no. 6, 1902–1913, DOI 10.1080/00927870701247005. ↑2.10

ALEX KÜRONYA, BUDAPEST UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND ECONOMICS, DEPARTMENT OF ALGEBRA, EGRY JÓZSEF U. 1., H-111 BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

GOETHE UNIVERSITÄT FRANKFURT, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, ROBERT-MAYER-STR. 6-10, D-60325 FRANKFURT AM MAIN, GERMANY
E-mail address: alex.kuronya@math.bme.hu